

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 11, 2010, claims 1-4, 19-31, and 34-36 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added or canceled. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, proposed amendments are presented for claims 1 and 19-27. In particular, the proposed amendments for these claims remove the “means for” language, while maintaining the substantive functional language. Also, in light of the removal of the “means for” language, the proposed amendments for claims 19-27 recite a method with functional operations, instead of structural “means for” limitations. These proposed amendments are supported by the previous language of the claims.

While these proposed amendments alter the language of the claims, Applicants submit that the remaining language of the claims nevertheless recites limitations that are substantially similar in scope and subject matter to the previously recited claims. Therefore, Applicants further submit that these proposed amendments should be entered without necessitating further searching.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-4, 19-31, and 34-36 were rejected based on one or more cited references. The cited reference(s) relied on in these rejections include:

Hesmer et al. (“Portlet Development Guide, Working with the Portlet API,” Edition 1.1, (April 2002), pp. 1-83, hereinafter Hesmer)

In particular, claims 1-4, 19-31, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hesmer. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Hesmer for the reasons provided below.

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable over Hesmer because Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1 recites:

An apparatus comprising:  
a portal server for operating a web portal to provide access to a web application;  
a computer readable storage medium comprising computer program code  
recorded thereon to implement a portlet application for operating on said portal server,  
for managing a collection of associated portlets;  
said portlet application configured to:  
initiate portlets on requests of a user to access said web application;  
manage a portlet application session object for said portlets, wherein the  
portlet application session object comprises a data store object shared by a  
plurality of the portlets in the portlet application; and  
said portlet application comprising:  
a portlet application session object data store controlled by said portlet  
application session object for saving parameters from user requests for associating  
said portlets with said portlet application session object.  
(Emphasis added.)

In contrast, Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Hesmer does not disclose a portlet application session object which includes a data store object shared by a plurality of portlets in a portlet application. In support of the rejection, with reference to the recited portlet application session object, the reasoning in Office Action refers to § 3.2.3 Portlet Session (page 20) and § 7.2.2 Storing data (pages 62-63) of Hesmer as purportedly disclosing the indicated limitation. However, Hesmer does not disclose a portlet application session object because the reasoning in the Office Action relies on an inaccurate characterization of the disclosure of Hesmer.

In order to accurately understand the disclosure of Hesmer, it is important to understand some basic terminology used within the disclosure of Hesmer. This discussion of terminology used in Hesmer does not necessarily characterize terminology used in the present application, but nevertheless provides a basis for understanding the scope of disclosure of Hesmer.

Hesmer describes a “portal” as a web site that provides aggregation of content from diverse sources. Hesmer, page 6, section 2, first paragraph. As used in Hesmer, “portletlets” are pluggable modules that are designed to run inside a portlet container of a

portal server. Hesmer, page 6, section 2, third paragraph. In other words, portlets provide the individual content resources within the portal. Hesmer also explains that related portlets may be packaged within a portlet application. Hesmer, page 11, section 2.4.1.

Figure 2 of Hesmer (reproduced below) illustrates an example of how a portlet may be instantiated. Specifically, the portlet is used to create a concrete portlet, which is a portlet parameterized by a single PortletSettings object (step 1). Hesmer, page 10, first two paragraphs. Then, a concrete portlet instance is created (step 2) when a user or administrator places the portlet on a page. Hesmer, page 10, third paragraph. The concrete portlet instance is parameterized by a single PortletData object. Id. When a user accesses a page that contains a portlet, a user portlet instance is created (step 3). Hesmer, page 10, fourth and fifth paragraphs. The user portlet instance is parameterized by a single PortletSession object. Id.




Figure 2: Manifestations of a portlet in the portal server

Thus, Hesmer describes three types of objects in conjunction with the illustration of Figure 2. The reasoning in the Office Action appears to reference two of these three types of objects: PortletData and PortletSession. However, neither PortletData nor PortletSession discloses a portlet application session object which includes a data store object shared by a plurality of portlets in a portlet application.

In regard to the PortletSession object, Hesmer does not describe sharing the PortletSession object. Rather, the PortletSession object is specific to each user portlet instance. See Fig. 2 on page 9. Therefore, the description of the PortletSession object is insufficient to disclose a portlet application session object shared by a plurality of portlets because the PortletSession object is not shared.

In contrast to the PortletSession object, Hesmer describes sharing the PortletData object. However, the PortletData object is not shared by a plurality of portlets in a portlet application. Rather, the PortletData object is only shared by different user portlet instances derived from the same concrete portlet instance. See Fig. 2 on page 9. Although there is some type of sharing with the PortletData object, there is no description of the separate user portlet instances being implemented within the same portlet application. Moreover, there would appear to be no reason to implement duplicate user portlet instances in the same portlet application. Therefore, the description of sharing the PortletData object among different user portlet instances in different portlet applications is insufficient to disclose sharing the PortletData object among a plurality of portlets in a single portlet application.

For the reasons presented above, Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Hesmer does not disclose a portlet application session object which includes a data store object shared by a plurality of portlets in a portlet application, as recited in the claim. In particular, neither the PortletSession object nor the PortletData object is shared by a plurality of portlets in a portlet application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is patentable over Hesmer because Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

### Independent Claims 19 and 28

Applicants respectfully assert independent claims 19 and 28 are patentable over Hesmer at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. Here, although the language of these claims differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of each claim should be interpreted independently of other claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejections of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claims 19 and 28 are patentable over Hesmer because Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claims.

Additionally, independent claim 19 is also patentable over Hesmer because Hesmer does not disclose further limitations recited in the claim. For reference, claim 19 recites “...to enable said multiple associated portlets to exchange data among each other” (emphasis added). In contrast, Hesmer does not disclose portlets which exchange data among each other. Although the reasoning in the Office Action refers to the discussion of the PortletSession object in section 3.2.3 of Hesmer, the PortletSession object of Hesmer does not enable exchanging data from one portlet to another. Rather, as discussed above, the PortletSession object of Hesmer merely parameterizes individual user portlet instances that are separate from one another. Therefore, Hesmer fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 19 because Hesmer does not disclose enabling portlets to exchange data among each other, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 19 is further patentable over Hesmer because Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

### Dependent Claims

Claims 2-4, 20-27, 29-31, and 34-36 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 19, and 28. Applicants respectfully assert these dependent claims are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of these dependent claims may be allowable for further reasons, as discussed below.

In regard to claims 3 and 25, Hesmer fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claims. For reference, claim 3 recites “said portlet application is further configured to

assign a common key to each portlet associated with said portlet application session object” (emphasis added). Claim 25 also recites “granting the key to each associated portlet...” In contrast to the language of the claims, the referenced portion of Hesmer fails to disclose assigning a common key to each portlet. Rather, the referenced portion of Hesmer merely describes maintaining a persistent backend connection. Although Hesmer describes using an identifier for the connection, the identifier is unique for each connection. However, the description of unique IDs is insufficient to disclose using a common key for each portlet associated with a portlet application session object. Therefore, Hesmer does not disclose all of the limitations of the indicated claims because Hesmer merely describes using a unique ID for each connection.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **09-0461** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **09-0461** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Holman/

Date: August 11, 2010

Jeffrey T. Holman

Reg. No. 51,812

Wilson Ham & Holman  
175 South Main Street  
Suite #850  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Phone: (801) 746-5560  
Fax: (801) 746-7451